

THE PROHIBITION OF PICTURES AND THE BASELESS FATWA OF SOME PAKISTANI MUFTIS



*By:
Mujlisul Ulama of South Africa
PO Box 3393
Port Elizabeth, 6056
South Africa*

THE PROHIBITION OF PICTURES

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“The worst punished on the Day of Qiyaamah will be the picture-makers.”

PICTURES – prohibited pictures – are pictures of animate objects – of people and animals. Such pictures are HARAAM, and this prohibition has been commanded by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and it has been the well-known, unanimous position of the Shariah since the era of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

In this era in close proximity to Qiyaamah, many maajin moron muftis have spuriously argued the permissibility of such pictures with the preposterously stupid reasoning that pictures produced by the camera and now the digital method are not prohibited pictures because they are not pictures. The absurdity and stupidity of this argument is self-evident. Only those who seek gratification for their nafsani desires accept this ridiculously stupid argument.

Now another spurious argument is being advanced by some misguided muftis of Pakistan. They argue that there never was unanimity on the prohibition. They have added this spurious contention to the camera-digital argument of Mufti Taqi. In this satanic process of arguing they have merely demonstrated their ignorance and *nafsaaniyat*.

Pretending to be oblivious of the deluges of sin, pornography and immorality stemming from photography and digital pictography of our era, this group of moron

muftis struggles with reckless stupidity to abrogate the 14 century Prohibition of pictures – a prohibition of which even the blatant transgressors are aware of. But, these miscreant muftis, bending over their backs with their stupid interpretations, and displaying absolute ignorance of the evils of pictography of our era, argue satanically for permissibility.

Even if we should momentarily accept that there is a difference of opinion and that these haraam pictures are permissible, genuine Muftis will not acquit themselves with the stupidity and recklessness of these so-called Naqshabandi-Shaazli moron muftis. The minimum demand of the Shariah in the event of permissibility is to invoke the principle of *Li ghairihi* and to proclaim pictures HARAAM *Li ghairi* without elaborating to the ignorant masses the meaning of *Li ghairihi*.

Grapes are a wonderful bounty of Allah Ta'ala. But will it be permissible to sell grapes specifically for the manufacture of liquor? The Ummah has been ruined by immorality and pornography of pictures. Every moron today, even small children, are in possession of cellphones which have become devices of Iblees. The morals of the entire Ummah lay in filth and the stench of pornography and immorality all based on pictography – the digital pictography which the moron clique of muftis has laboured painfully and abortively to prove permissibility.

Intelligence and Imaan demand that all avenues of sin and immorality be closed. It is the obligation of a genuine

Mufti to bring Muslims closer to Allah Ta'ala, not to drive a wedge and create a chasm to separate them from Allah Ta'ala. Just what business do these wayward muftis have with legalizing a practice which has become the basis for such deluges of evil and filth in which the Ummah is drowning? The Imaan and Akhlaaq of nations have been ruined and destroyed by the digital pictography which these reckless clique of muftis as well as mufti Taqi has satanically halaalized on the basis of the most spurious arguments which portray the evil in their hearts and the convolution of their brains.

UMOOM BALWA

These muftis have resorted to misappropriation of Fiqhi technicalities and Fiqhi principles to make halaal something which destroys Imaan and Akhlaaq. Thus, they stupidly aver: *“This matter pertains to Umoom Balwa.”* Explaining this principle, the miscreant bogus Naqshabandi-Shaazli mufti says:

“There are two words in umoom balwa. (1) Umoom which means to include. (2) Balwa – literally it means to adopt and to test. If we combine both, for defining it, then the following is acquired from the texts of the Fuqaha:

‘The state which includes numerous people and from which abstention is difficult.’ Some Fuqaha have explained it as ‘Adh-Dhururatul Aammah’ (universal need) and some as ‘Adh-dhururatul Maas-sah or Haajatun Naas (the need of people).”

On the basis of this Fiqhi principle and similar technicalities, have the miscreant muftis concluded the permissibility of pictography. However, every sincere Muslim, lacking in higher Islamic Knowledge, on the

basis of the command of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam): “*Seek a fatwa from your heart*”, is able to understand the incongruency and stupidity of the fatwa of permissibility issued by the bogus Naqshabandi-Shaazli muftis of Pakistan.

The claim of permissibility by these wayward muftis is an oxymoron mix. The labyrinthal arguments proffered by them for substantiating their claim of permissibility are incongruous and a combination of opposites. Despite the claim of permissibility, they labour painfully to argue away the Prohibition which at times they have to concede is the view of the *Jamhoor* (the vast majority of the Ummah). Thus, they vacillate between two extremes – permissible and prohibited.

Now since their official stance is of permissibility, then what is the need to cite a plethora of such technicalities which are applicable to only haraam issues. For example *Najis* water. Impure water is haraam. There is *Ijma'* of the Ummah that it is not permissible to use impure water. However, if pure (*Taahir*) water is nowhere available since all water pumped into the taps of the entire population is *najis* such as recycled sewage water, then the principle of *Umoom Balwa*, *Haajat*, *Dhururat*, etc. will become operative.

If no halaal medicine is available, then it will not be sinful to use haraam medicine. But this concession is not based on *Umoom Balwa*. The principles of *Dhururat* and *Haajat* come into operation.

Furthermore, for the edification of these bogus muftis, we inform them that the principle of *Umoom Balwa* is valid in the Chapter of Tahaarat, not elsewhere. In other avenues of definite and dire need, there are other *Fiqhi* Usool for recourse such as *Dhururat* and *Haajat*. These principles are invoked to temporarily render halaal issues which are per se *HARAAM*.

It logically follows, that the *maqjin* moron bogus Naqshabandi-Shaazli muftis have employed these *Fiqhi* principles to render halaal pictography which is *HARAAM*. If pictography was halaal, then why seek refuge in the *Fiqhi* principles which have been formulated specifically for the rendition of haraam into temporary halaal? When the factor for such rendition ends, the decree of *hillat* (being halaal) will also terminate and the issue will revert to its original attribute of *hurmat* (*prohibition*). Thus, this very invocation of a plethora of *Fiqhi* principles and technicalities by the miscreants confirms that the original ruling pertaining to pictography is *HURMAT* which these fellows have stupidly attempted to halaalize by the misapplication of the principles of *Umoom Balwa*, *Dhururat* and *Haajat*.

Innumerable things are permissible *per se*. For confirmation of their permissibility, there is no need to sustain the ruling of permissibility with the incongruous use of *Fiqhi* principles which are totally unrelated to the issue of permissibility, e.g. it is not necessary, in fact it is stupid, to say that bread and apples are halaal because of *umoom balwa*. The very fact that they have introduced the dimension of *Fiqhi* principles and technicalities to

laboriously argue in favour of permissibility pulls the carpet from under their feet. It confirms that pictography is haraam, but has become temporarily halaal (i.e. in their brains) due to the *umoom balwa* principle which they have mismanipulated and presented incongruously. Umoom Balwa never legalizes zina, pork and liquor. It never makes halaal that which is haraam except in issues pertaining to the domain of Tahaarat.

Now let us scrutinize the claim of “*big and small, great ulama and great shuyookh*” all being implicated and involved in pictography as asserted by the bogus muftis. Even if this averment is factual, it never is grounds for the invocation of umoom balwa which relates to only issues pertaining to Tahaarat. In which way are these supposedly ‘great and illustrious’ personalities (ulama and shuyookh) involved in pictography? Are they compelled to indulge in this *kabeera* sin for which terrible punishments are sounded in the Hadith? If yes, the moron muftis should elaborate on the factors of compulsion. While compulsion exists in the matter of identity document photos imposed on us by kuffaar governments, there is absolutely no *haajat and no dhururat and no tadhyeeq* to compel these moron ulama and bogus shuyookh to display their ugly snouts on social media platforms. Just what is the imperative need to advertise their ugliness on facebook and similar other haraam porno-media? Identity photos being excluded from the dimension of sin is not the effect of *Umoom Balwa*. Muslims submit to this governmental demand on the basis of *Ikraah (compulsion)*.

The involvement of big and small in this evil does not in any way bring about concession in the Prohibition. If the entire Muslim population indulges in zina and liquor and interest, NEVER will these major sins ever become halaal on the basis of the Fiqhi principles cited by the bogus Naqshabandi-Shaazli muftis nor on the basis of any other Fiqhi principle.

What type of *daleel for jawaaz* is the indulgence in explicit haraam – an indulgence which is not compelled and which is easily avoidable? It is a stupid, *nafsaani* ‘daleel’ of stupid *maajin* bogus muftis who are all signs of Qiyaamah.

Ease (Sahlah)

Presenting another incongruous argument, the miscreants cite the Hadith: *“I have been sent with the straight and easy deen.”* Then they mention: *“All concessions and latitude are based on this principle (that is: the ease mentioned in the cited Hadith).”*

The incongruity of their contention is manifest. Firstly, the ‘ease’ mentioned in this Hadith does not presuppose that the severe penal code and the strict imposition of the masaa-il of the Shariah in all spheres of life are difficult, hence the entire Shariah should be diluted on the basis of the application of this Hadith which has been grossly misunderstood by the clique of deviant muftis. The meaning of ‘ease’ mentioned in the Hadith is never what the miscreants wish to understand. Despite the ‘ease’ mentioned in the Hadith, the Shariah’s *ahkaam* are and remain severe such as stoning to death, whipping, cutting off hands, etc., etc.

These severities may not be abrogated on the basis of the ‘ease’ mentioned in the Hadith. The actual meaning of the Hadith is that all the *Ahkaam* of the Shariah are ‘straight’ and ‘easy’ regardless of the convoluted understanding of liberal and zindeeq ‘muslims’ – an understanding which has been brainwashed into them by the kuffaar who accuse the Shariah of cruelty, injustice and the like. The Shariah may not be tampered with misinterpretation of the morons. They either do not understand or they stupidly misinterpret to serve their satanic agendas.

On the basis of this Hadith, the prohibition of pictures is ‘straight’ and ‘easy’. There is no difficulty in the observance of this Prohibition. Abstention from exhibiting one’s snout on these haraam porno-social media poses no difficulty. Besides governmental pressure and compulsion for certain types of photos, there is no compulsion whatsoever in other spheres for making use of pictures. Staying far from zina as commanded by the Qur’aan is not in conflict with the ‘*sahlah*’ (*ease*) mentioned in the Hadith.

Khabar Waahid

Khabar Waahid is a Hadith classification which lacks the Absolute Certitude of Ahaadith of higher classification.

Stating another incongruous ‘daleel’, the moron muftis cite the following statement of the Ahnaaf: “*The Hanafis say that amal shall not be on Khabar Waahid in acts in which indulgence is repeated and in which umoom balwa prevails.*”

In fact, we can progress further and even say that *umoom balwa* will operate in acts substantiated by even *Nass-e-Qat'i* (*Absolute, explicit proof*) substantiated by the highest category of Shar'i daleel – Qur'aan and Ahaadith Mutawaatir. When a dire need (*Dhururat*) exists in the meaning of the Shariah, then the Prohibition will be temporarily relaxed and the concession of permissibility will apply as long as the *Dhururat* prevails. But in the case of pornography and displaying of snouts on haraam social media, and videoing Bukhari jalsahs and the like there exists absolutely no *dhururat* for lifting the Prohibition. The '*dhururat*' has been intentionally hallucinated by the morons to gratify their base desires and worldly objectives.

The claim that it is most difficult to abstain from pictures, is a preposterous LIE. It is a canard of their nafs. Stupidly invoking *umoom balwa* on this false premise is plain chicanery. It should be well understood that the principles which justify invocation of concession and laxity do not abrogate the Hukm of the Shariah. The operation of the *umoom balwa* and similar other principles is temporary. The disappearance of the factor which justifies the invocation of the principle, cancels the concession. The original law will then return. But in the case of pictures and porno which these miscreant muftis stupidly legalize on the basis of *umoom balwa* is a satanic canard. Concerned Muslims do abstain without difficulty (*mashaqqat*) from pictures in general. Tomorrow they will justify interest, liquor and zina too on the basis of their convoluted and corrupt understanding of *umoom*

balwa. In fact, Mufti Taqi has already legalized interest under the guise of Shariah designations. Others have halaalized liquor on the basis of Fiqhi technicalities in the same way as these *maqjin* muftis have halaalized pictography which Taqi Sahib has made halaal many years before these bogus Naqshabandi-Shaazli moron muftis had surfaced.

The Camera and the Painted Pictures

The attempt by these *maqjin* muftis to differentiate between the camera picture and the painted picture is putrid and an insult to intelligence. Their argument for bolstering this preposterous stupidity is laughable and must be dismissed with contempt. Only vermiculated brains can argue that a picture produced by a camera or by means of the digital system is not a picture. The end product is the picture. The method is not the target of the Shariah. The method could be employed constructively and in a halaal manner. The product of the method is haraam, namely the picture. Regardless of the method of production, a picture remains haraam. Even a child laughs at the stupid idea that the image produced by painting is a picture and the image produced by the camera is not a picture. This idea is compound rubbish – rubbish for which the *maqjin* muftis of today are notorious with their zigzag fatwas.

The Printed Picture

Uttering real drivel, these miscreants say: “*The printed picture is Makrooh Tanzihi and the digital reflection which is in the camera or in the mobile phone is not included in the prohibition nor is it Makrooh Tanzihi. In fact it is per se permissible.*”

Why is the printed picture even *Makrooh Tanzihi* when the stance of these miscreants is that of permissibility. What renders it even *Makrooh Tanzihi*? What makes the printed picture detestable even to the extent of *tanzih*? Should the abhorrence for pictures displayed by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) be classified as *Makrooh Tanzihi*? Is the Fiqhi effect of the exceptionally severe punishment mentioned in the Ahaadith for pictures, *Makrooh Tanzihi*? Only brains on which Iblees has urinated have the satanic audacity to classify such abhorrence as ‘*makrooh tanzih*.’ Furthermore, just why should they classify it even ‘*makrooh tanzih*’ when they are of the belief that pictures are permissible?

Promoting pornography

While viewing the reflection (*aqs*) of something which is *halaal* to look at is permissible, that same reflection is also *haraam* if it is of something which is *haraam* to look at, e.g. a *ghair mahram*. Just as it is *haraam* to look at a *haraam* reflection in a mirror so too is it *haraam* to look at the images in the mobile phone even if these have not yet been printed.

That the vast majority of people utilize their cellphones for *haraam* porno and immorality is not a secret. These stupid muftis with their baseless arguments for proving permissibility of cellphone pictures are in fact promoting pornography and all other displays of immorality of these satanic devices. Just what has constrained these *Hufaalah* to ignore in entirety the porno-filth of digital pictography? Even if we assume that such images are permissible, never will it be permissible to open wide the

avenue of pornography and immorality for the masses. In fact, these wayward molvis and muftis with their zigzag haraam fatwas seek to justify their own immoral social media indulgences, hence the need to forge and fabricate arguments to condone their haraam indulgences. That is the primary reason for them going to such extraordinary lengths to justify an institution which causes destruction to the Akhlaaq and Imaan of the Ummah.

What has happened to their Aql? It is quite manifest that divinely cast *rijs* (filth) has deranged their *aql*. Regarding such derangement, the Qur'aan Majeed says:

“And Allah casts rijs on (the brains) of those who lack understanding.”

This lack of understanding is self-induced to gratify the inordinate dictates of the nafs. When the nafs asserts its dominance, the aql becomes subservient to it. Due to this intentional inversion of the order, Allah Ta'ala casts *rijs* on their brains, and this precludes them from understanding obvious truths, leave alone the texts of the Kutub from which they copiously misquote and misapply.

A Nonsensical Averment

Self-contradicting their permissibility stance, the clique of miscreants say:

“The thing which is haraam externally will also be haraam by means of the camera, and whatever is permissible externally will be permissible by the camera.”

This averment in no way whatsoever supports the contention of permissibility of pictures of animate objects. Such pictures are haraam both externally and internally in the camera. In fact this averment is nonsensical. As long as the image inside the camera has not been transformed into a picture it will not be a picture. The actual picture produced by means of the camera is haraam. Just as a pen is not haraam so too the camera is not haraam. However, the picture produced by the pen is haraam and likewise is the picture produced by the camera haraam. The camera is like the pen and the brush. It is merely an instrument of production. The Shariah's Prohibition is directed at the picture produced by the camera or by the digital method. But the density of the brains of the miscreant muftis precluded them from understanding this simple, obvious reality.

Statues – A misconceived notion

The understanding that the warnings of *Athaab* issued by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) refer to only statues (three dimensional figures), not to painted/drawn pictures is absolutely corrupt and satanic. Jibraeel (Alayhis salaam) refused to enter the home of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) because there was a curtain with a picture hanging in the house. He ordered that the curtain be cut up and the picture defaced/effaced. This was not a statue. It was a picture embroidered on the curtain. There is no difference of opinion on this score. All say that pictures were on the curtain, not statues.

The Hadith states with clarity: *“Cut off the heads of the pictures or cut it (the curtain) and make it into cushions...”* The command was to destroy the pictures.

There are many Ahaadith which explicitly forbid pictures of animate objects, and all narrations refer to pictures, not to statues. It is indeed deviation manifest to misinterpret the relevant Ahaadith and to scuttle the Prohibition on the absolutely baseless claim that the prohibition relates to statues. There is no valid Shar'i daleel for this stupid and baseless claim.

Fitnah and Fasaad of Pictures

Again assuming that there is '*ikhtilaaf*' in this issue, what has constrained these miscreant morons to seek ways for scuttling the popular understanding of *hurmat*, especially when there is no need for this stupid exercise and especially in this era of fitnah and fasaad in which pictography plays the greatest satanic role of destroying Akhlaaq and Imaan?

The Ummah is drowning in deluges of fitnah and fasaad. If these miscreant muftis were sincere, they would have concentrated their energy and brains to tackle the numerous issues of fitnah. But instead of attending to the *islaah* of the Ummah, they deem it appropriate to open avenues of vice and immorality with their haraam, zigzag incongruent fatwas.

Hadhrat Anwar Shah Kashmiri

Citing Hadhrat Anwar Shah Kashmiri, the *maqjin* muftis say that there is no daleel for claiming that the screen should be torn in such a way as to destroy the pictures. This contention is surprisingly incorrect. The Hadith states with clarity:

“Cut off their heads.” If indeed Hadhrat Anwar Shah Kashmiri had stated what has been attributed to him, then he has erred. His view is unacceptable.

Ta’zeem (Reverence)

Uttering another preposterous self-contradiction, the clique of bogus Naqshabandi-Shaazli muftis say:

“It is established from all the references that the hukm of hurmat will apply where there is ta’zeem (reverence for the pictures). Where there is no ta’zeem, the hukm of hurmat will not apply. However, all the Ulama Kiraam are of the view of Karaahat Tanzihi. There is no ikhtilaaf in this.”

These muftis claim that there is *Ijma’ (Consensus)* on the view that pictures are Makrooh Tanzihi. How is this possible? Why would pictures be Makrooh Tanzihi for those who believe that they are permissible? Bread is permissible, and thousands of things are permissible. Why would they then be Makrooh Tanzihi?

How is it possible to have consensus on the *Karaahat Tanzihi* view when many or some say that pictures are permissible? The claim of *Ijma’* on the *Tanzihi* view is another incongruity and canard of the *maajin* muftis floundering in their confusion with which they have attempted to obfuscate the issue of Prohibition of pictures.

Ijma’ (Consensus)

In their confusion, they resorted to the chicanery of dismissing the *Ijma’* view stated explicitly by Imaam

Nawawi (Rahmatullah alayh). In their capital blunder of dismissing the view stated by Imaam Nawawi (Rahmatullah alayh), the miscreant muftis say:

“Most of us cite the statement of Imaam Nawawi. He has written that every kind of picture is haraam and he has narrated Ijma’ on this view whereas this is erroneous. His statement is: ‘Making pictures of animate objects is exceptionally/severely haraam whether it be on cloth or carpet, or dirham or dinar.’ ”

Dismissing this categoric statement of this illustrious Imaam, the moron muftis say: *“It is his own opinion. There is no kind of Ijma. The Maslak of the Shawaafi’ is entirely different from the statement of Imam Nawawi.”*

This claim is preposterously ludicrous and even slanderous. This illustrious Imaam was not a thumb-sucker such as these *maqjin* muftis. He did not claim *hurmat* and *Ijma’* without solid basis. In his *Sharah of Muslim*, Imaam Nawawi (Rahmatullah alayh) states:

“Our Ashaab (i.e. the Shaafi’ Fuqaha) and other Ulama say that making pictures of animate objects is severely haraam. It is among the Kabaa-ir (major sins) because warnings (of punishment) have been issued in the Ahaadith. Making pictures (of animate objects) is haraam in all cases because in it is the emulation of the creation of Allah. (And it is prohibited) whether it is in cloth, or on matting, dirham, dinar, fals, utensils or on walls, etc.

...

*There is no difference in all of this regardless of it having a shadow (a statue) or no shadow. This is the summary of our (Shaaafi') Math-hab in this mas'alah. The Jamhoor (i.e. of the other Math-habs) Ulama of the Sahaabah, Taabieen and those after them have the same view. And this is the Math-hab of Thauri, Maalik, Abu Hanifah and others. Some of the Salaf have said that which has a shadow is prohibited, and there is nothing wrong if the picture has no shadow. This math-hab (view) is **baatil** because no one doubted the fact that the pictures in the curtain which Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) castigated were evil, and they were shadowless. This is in addition to the other Ahaadith (which prohibit pictures) mutlaqan (i.e. without the restriction of shadow).*

Zuhri (Rahmatullah alayh) said that the Prohibition of pictures is umoom (general – applicable to all pictures even without shadows).

Similarly (is it prohibited) to use anything on which there are pictures, and (similarly is it prohibited) to enter a house in which there are pictures whether these are decorations on clothing, etc. or fixed on the wall or carpet, and whether despised or not. This is based on the explicit (zaahir) text of the Ahaadith, especially the Hadith regarding the cushions narrated by Muslim. This is the strong Math-hab."

Thus, Imaam Nawawi (Rahmatullah alayh) did not fabricate an opinion by means of thumb-sucking as the miscreant muftis imply. The *Ijma'* which he narrated is not his personal opinion. He cites the Shawaafi' Fuqaha as well as other illustrious Fuqaha. It is slanderous to

accuse this great and illustrious Faqih of tendering a baseless opinion.

The isolated contrary view proffered by the miscreants does not detract from the validity of the *Ijma'* of the Jamhoor Fuqaha of all Math-habs. The contrary view is obscure, isolated and **BAATIL**. It has no effect on the *Ijma'* of the Prohibition. The insinuation that Imaam Nawawi (Rahmatullah alayh) had proffered a baseless personal opinion is contemptible, and only moron miscreant muftis are capable of such slander against such a renowned and illustrious authority as Imaam Nawawi (Rahmatullah alayh).

The Ahaadith *Nusoos* unequivocally prohibit pictures of animate objects and mention the severest punishment for their makers. Only deviates influenced by Iblees have the satanic temerity to argue in this belated era against the 14 century prohibition which is the popular view understood and accepted by the Ummah of every era even by those who act in violation of the prohibition.

Their Zigzag Fatwa

It devolves as an obligation on these wayward muftis to seriously reflect on the harm they are causing the Ummah with their zigzag haraam fatwa disgorged to halaalize an institution which has ruined the Akhlaaq and Imaan of millions and millions of Muslims who have become addicted to cellphone and digital pornography on the basis of Taqi's digital picture shaitaani fatwa. It is the obligation of Muftis to divert Muslims from immorality – fisq and fujoor, not to open avenues for sin, vice and

transgression. May Allah Ta'ala grant them the hidaayat to understand their mammoth folly.

They are Bogus Naqshabandi-Shaazlis

We say that the group of Pakistani muftis who have issued the corrupt fatwa in their nefarious attempt to scuttle the 14 century *Ijma'* of the Ummah on the Prohibition of pictures of animate objects are BOGUS Naqshabandis and BOGUS Shaazilis. They are not genuine followers of Hadhrat Naqshabandi (Rahmatullah alayh) and Hadhrat Shaazli (Rahmatullah alayh). These two were great and illustrious Auliya – Sufis of the highest class who did not engage in conflict with the Fuqaha.

While these wayward muftis advertise themselves as Naqshabandis and Shaazilis, it is clear from the manner in which they acquit themselves in their zigzag fatwa of corruption that they are bereft of the haziest understanding of the Tareeqah of these great Sufiyya. The Sufiyya Kiraam are extreme in the observance of *Ihtiyaat* (Caution) and *Taqwa*. Far from opening up avenues for fisq and fujoor as do these crank muftis, the Sufiyya emphasize their Math-hab of *Taqwa* which overrides even the *Usool* of Fiqh in so far as their practical lives are concerned.

Hadhrat Naqshabandi and Hadhrat Shaazli (Rahmatullah alayhima) were such devotees who were immersed in Divine Love. They were not crass materialists led on by the nafs and Iblees as are these miscreant wayward muftis. Furthermore, a Sufi does not advertise himself as such. His Math-hab demands that he remains unknown

and forlorn. The Sufi does not surf through Fiqh'i kutub in search of obscurities and isolated views to disrupt and scuttle the *Ijma'* of the Fuqaha. Regarding muftis of the type of these miscreants, Allaama Abdul Wahhaab Sha'raani (Rahmatullah alayh), a great Shaafi' authority said:

“He who holds on to the nawaadir of the Ulama has made an exit from Islam.”

These wayward, miscreant, liberal zigzag muftis should hang their heads in shame for their dastardly attempt to scuttle the Prohibition which has been known to the Ummah in every era of Islam's history.

They dig out from the kutub views which are *baatil, isolated and obscure* to obfuscate the standing ruling of the Shariah, and this they do to appease the bestial dictates of the nafs and to swim with the fussaag and fujjaar in the corrupt, filthy immoral waters of the satanic social media which have destroyed the Akhlaaq and Imaan of the Ummah. Indeed they are of the *Hufaalah* class stated by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam):

“The Salihoon are departing (from the dunya) one after the other in (quick) succession. Then shall remain only the hufaalah (Rubbish, flotsam and jetsam) such as the chaff of barley or dates. Allah will not have any care whatsoever for them.”

Yet, these cranks and quacks designate themselves as Sufis of the Naqshabandi-Shaazli Order of Tasawwuf.

They have not even smelt of the fragrance of the Tareeq of Hadhrat Naqshabandi and Hadhrat Shaazli (Rahmatullah alayhima).

CONCLUSION

IJMA' ON THE PROHIBITION

The denial of the existence of Ijma' on the Prohibition of pictures of animate objects is a shaitani inspiration. Such pictures will remain haraam until the Day of Qiyaamah. The stupid academic gymnastics of maajin muftis will not succeed to efface the Ahkaam of the Shariah which the Ummah has acquired from the Sahaabah and the illustrious Fuqaha.

Some statements of Authorities of the Shariah are reproduced here in rebuttal of the trash disgorged by the miscreant bogus Naqshabandi-Shaazli muftis of Pakistan.

“Ibn Hajar Makki Haitami (rahmatullah alayh) says in his Kitaab, Azzawaajir aniktiraafil kabaa-ir: The making of pictures of living objects on anything whatsoever is a kabira (great) sin. The authentic Ahadith state so clearly. The making of pictures of living objects is Haraam without any conditions stipulated to it.”

(AT-TA'LEEQUL MUMAJJAD ALAA MUATTA
IMAM MUHAMMAD)

Shah Waliullah Muhaddith Dahlawi (Rahmatullah alayh) states:

“The abhorrence of the Angels for pictures is necessary because in pictures the meaning of idols has been established, and it is a fact that from the realms above

descend wrath and curses upon idols and their worshippers. When mankind is resurrected on the Day of Qiyamah the pictures of the picture-maker will be given life. His pictures will assume the forms he had in mind at the time he made these. This will be so because it is most appropriate for him because he (the picture-maker) endeavours to the best of his ability to represent his imagination in the form of these pictures. Thus, these will assume the forms of hardship, i.e. he will be required to instil life in the pictures, and he will not be able to do so.”
(HUJJATUL-LAHIL BAALIGHAH)

“The Messenger of Allah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that it is not permissible for me or a Prophet to enter a house decorated with pictures.
Since the making of pictures and the wearing of clothing having pictures on them are forbidden, it follows that homes adorned with pictures should be shunned.”
(HUJJATUL-LAHIL BAALIGHAH)

“The Shariah has declared picture-making as being absolutely forbidden (Haraam Qat’i), and the use of pictures forbidden as well.”
(Mufti Muhammad Shafi, Grand Mufti of Pakistan)

“It is not permissible to make pictures of animate objects as well as of such inanimate objects which are worshipped, like the cross. The Ahadith have severely denigrated the picture-maker.”
(FATAAWA RAHIMIYA)

Shaikh Mustufaa Hamaami (Rahmatullah alayh) of Egypt writes:

“Shaikh Nawawi’s (Rahmatullah alayh) statements clearly indicate that Ijma’ (Consensus of Opinion of the Jurists) is recorded on the prohibition of pictures of living creatures. There exists no difference of opinion on this score among the Ulama of Islam ...

Shaikh Ibn Arabi (Rahmatullah alayh) said that the prohibition extends over all pictures. Imaam Aini (Rahmatullah alayh) states in Sharhul Bukhari:

‘It is recorded in Taudheeh that our Ulama as well as other Ulama have said that the making of pictures of living objects is Haraam, and this practice is a Kabira (great) sin, because in this practice is the imitation of Allah's creation. Pictures of animate objects, whether these are on cloth, carpets, coins, utensils, walls, are all Haraam ... Imaam Malik, Imaam Thauri, Imaam Abu Hanifah and other groups of Jurists as well hold the same view.’ ”

Shaikh Hamaami (Rahmatullah alayh) further adds:

“Imaam Aini (Rahmatullah alayh) has accepted the Ijma’ on this prohibition recorded by Imaam Nawawi (Rahmatullah alayh). Imaam Aini is one of the Hanafi Jurists ...

Imaam Zuhri (Rahmatullah alayh) says that the prohibition of picture-making is general (not qualified with any conditions). Similarly the use of an object which has pictures on it is forbidden. And, it is not permissible to enter a house which contains pictures. This Mazhab (of

Imaam Zuhri) is the strong Mazhab (i.e. well substantiated with proofs).

I take an oath by Allah (says Shaikh Hamaami) that I incline towards the view of Imaam Zuhri (Rahmatullah alayh). By the grace of Allah I have probed and established this matter thoroughly. When picture-making is forbidden, the logical conclusion is that use of pictures is likewise forbidden.”

“Shaikh Makki (Rahmatullah alayh) states in Hidayah: ‘I cannot recall that a single Alim has said that pictures are lawful’.”

“Shaikh Abu Hayyaan (rahmatullah alayh) says that Ijma’ exists on the prohibition of pictures. He has stated emphatically that those who have said that pictures are permissible are not among the Ulama.”

Commenting on this statement of Shaikh Abu Hayyaan (Rahmatullah alayh), Shaikh Mustufaa Hamaami (Rahmatullah alayh) of Egypt says:

“I have no hesitation in supporting Shaikh Abu Hayyaan on this score. I am astonished and amazed when even an ordinary Muslim (i.e. non-Alim) says that pictures are lawful despite the fact that many authentic Ahaadith of our Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) have branded this practice of pictures as a Kabira sin.”

“Those who are so audacious in this practice of pictures should heed well the warnings in the Ahadith that on the Day of Qiyamah in Hell, life will be created in all the animate pictures produced. These will then torture the

picture-makers. What greater chastisement could there be?”

(EXTRACTED FROM BAYYINAAT OF SHAIKHUL
HADITH HAZRAT MAULANA MUHAMMAD
YUSUF BINNOORI)

“Pictures are generally worshipped by the idolaters, and are therefore detested by the Angels, as well as despised by the Prophet. The makers of them will be duly punished on the Day of Resurrection because they are the cause of providing materials for idolatry. ... It is therefore, necessary to take the pictures out of good houses, as impure things, and then the Prophet (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) will be pleased with you, and your house will be entered by the Angels; and thus there will be blessings all over it ... Hence the crime of making pictures is very great, greater than that of Yazid and Shimar ...”

(MUJADDID, HAZRAT MAULANA ISMAIL
SHAHEED, in TAQWIYATUL IMAAN)

Imaam Shaafi (Rahmatullah alayh) states:

“And, if one sees pictures of living creatures in the premises where one has been invited to, one should not enter that place. ... Verily, it is forbidden to make pictures of objects which have life in them ...”

(KITAABUL UMM OF IMAAM SHAAFI)

PROHIBITION OF PICTURES

THE ISSUE IS NOT THE METHOD OF MAKING PICTURES NOR THE OBSCURE DIFFERENCE OF OPINION

Question

Many Ulama of Deoband are nowadays saying that digital pictures are not the prohibited pictures mentioned in the Hadith. Although this does not seem to be correct, why do they differentiate between pictures on the basis of methods of production?

“Muftī ‘Abū al-Qāsim Nu’mānī is the Shaykh al-Hadīth of Deoband. He also served as Muhtamim from 2011 to 2020, where after he was appointed to his current post. He’s been part of Dār al-‘Ulūm’s Majlis-e-Shūra since 1992.

One of my former colleagues in New York, an Imām and Mudarris, is Bayt to him. He had studied under Muftī ‘Abū al-Qāsim in Deoband and professed strong love for him. Yet despite his Shaykh’s well-known antipathy for photography, this colleague had an incorrigible habit of indulging in the same. He photographed and videoed students at the request of his employer, posed for others when they requested to film or photograph him, and freely watched YouTube, etc. as a pastime. I believe his admiration for Muftī Taqī Usmānī – which he expressed to me several times – helped him justify such behavior.

The situation eventually deteriorated to the extent that advertisers featuring him and Maktab children were being printed out and left inside the Musalla itself. The egregiousness of defiling a place of worship with Harām Tasāwīr was entirely lost on him. At this juncture I stopped addressing him as “Mawlana”, “Huzūr”, etc. in our personal interactions and when mentioning him to others. I resolved to write to Muftī ‘Abū al-Qāsim about this Murīd and request his intervention. A few recent discoveries have eliminated that resolve, however.

I was searching for an audio declamation against photography from Muftī ‘Abū al-Qāsim. I wanted to forward it to my colleague by way of admonition, but in the process I found that Muftī ‘Abū al-Qāsim has also started to appear on video and television. Strangely enough, he still maintains that digital photography is impermissible and vehemently criticizes those that indulge in it in his presence.

In a recent function he publicly and severely upbraided a person who had taken his photograph whilst he was giving or about to give a talk. For about seven minutes thereafter he solemnly spoke about the sin of photography and expounded on its punishment in the Ākhirah. And yet, at the very same time he was inveighing against photography, he was being filmed at close-range by multiple handheld and mounted cameras. Many onlookers and YouTube viewers were left either bemused or amused by the situation. One of the latter mockingly commented that, “Bayaan aapka

kisme record hora rahe? Mufti sahab aasmaan se farishto se mangway kiya camera?”. Another said, “Photo grafi haraam hai- maolana video grafi sunnat hai, ya sawab hai? Mufti sahab zara wazaahat karden”.

Besides the aforementioned video, there’s quite a few more which are widely available on the internet. Some show him tying turbans at a Dastarbandī ceremony. In others he’s delivering a bayān, and several have him discussing local politics with TV reporters. In these circumstances, when the Pīr himself is publicly committing the same infractions, what use is it to try to get him to redress the shenanigans of his Murīdīn?

Also worth mentioning is that the current Muhtamim of Dār al-‘Ulūm, Syed Mawlānā Arshad Madanī, is himself better known as ‘media personality’ to many people in and outside of India who’re unacquainted with Deoband. As the Amīr of Jāmiāt-e-‘Ulamā-e-Hind, he’s seemingly incapable of fulfilling his duties without being on TV and other types of video broadcasts. In fact, the broader Madanī family, with the apparent blessings of Mawlānā Arshad, have inaugurated a media platform called “Madanī TV.” ”

(End of the Brother’s letter)

ANSWER

The deviate molvis have kicked up much dust and churned up much hot air by presenting the red herring of the method of production and difference of opinion regarding the prohibition. Bereft of any valid argument to bolster their baseless claim of permissibility, they present

two flaccid and flapdoodle stupid arguments to scuttle the Prohibition of pictures of animate objects.

- (1) They say that while a picture drawn with pen and paint is a prohibited picture, the picture produced by the camera and the digital method is not a picture.
- (2) There is difference of opinion regarding the prohibition.

We as well as other Ulama have thoroughly debunked these stupid arguments which are bereft of any logic and sense. There are many publications in refutation of their absurd claim of a digital picture not being a picture. Furthermore, there is complete Consensus of all our Akaabir Ulama on the Prohibition of pictures of animate objects. Then the strongest Dalaail for the Prohibition are the Ahaadith which unequivocally prohibit and condemn pictures.

Thus, our present discussion, will not repeat the valid arguments in refutation of the stupidities of the deviates. Let us look at this issue from another perspective, and that is the evil, the sin and the moral filth and destruction caused to the Ummah by pictures. Assuming that digital pictures are not pictures within the purview of the prohibition of pictures stated in the Hadith, then too, it is absolutely satanic and villainous to justify such pictures in view of the evil which these pictures generate.

Only sincerity is required to understand this perspective. A vast satanic avenue of immorality and obscenity has been opened by digital pictography which the likes of

Mr. Taqi Usmani has halaalized. The vast majority of the Ummah has become addicted to cellphone and video pornography, haraam movies and filth of a variety of kinds. Innumerable illicit relationships have been struck up via cellphone communication. In every such evil relationship, males and females mutually exchange pictures of themselves in various postures of nudity and zina.

The addiction to pictures has ruined the Akhlaaq of the Ummah. This addiction has created a complete desensitization regarding sins of the zina dimension. On the basis of the justification and promotion of the hallucinated permissibility of digital pictography, the addiction stemming from it has completely diluted and even eliminated inhibition for sins of zina committed on these satanic devices. No longer are there any pangs of conscience for the deluge of zina sins committed by Muslims in the wake of the halaalization of digital pictography by deviates about whom Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“I fear most for my Ummah such aimmah who are mudhilleen.”

The ‘aimmah’ are the deviate, evil scholars for dollars who pursue worldly and nafsani objectives under deeni cover. They are labelled ‘mudhilleen’ for they mislead the ignorant Muslim masses. They lead them into the den of vice and satanism. Those who argue against the Prohibition of pictures are perfect examples of aimmah mudhilleen.

Viewing this picture issue from the perspective of the irreparable moral and Imaani damage it has caused the vast majority of the Ummah who has become addicted to cellphone zina and pornography, and which has caused the breakdown of innumerable marriages, there is no need to delve into the issue of prohibition or permissibility of pictures.

Every molvi of mediocre qualification is aware or should be aware of the simple Fiqhi principle of Hurmat li ghairihi. While something may be lawful per se, evil and harmful external factors becoming attached to the lawful practice/institution will render it (the lawful issue) haraam. Grapes are halaal. However, selling grapes to a winery is Haraam Lighairihi. Anything which causes haraam is likewise haraam.

There is no honest and sincere Muslim who will deny the colossal harm and damage to Akhlaaq and Imaan caused by pictures – digital pictures – even if we have to momentarily and stupidly insult our intelligence with the shaitaani idea that digital pictures are not pictures. The stupid and absurd argument of digital pictures not being pictures and the alleged difference of opinion are of no significance in the context of the Prohibition of cellphone and video pictures based on digital pictography. Setting aside this red herring argument, the evil and immorality stemming from these supposedly permissible pictures should be the primary grounds for Prohibition just as the winery is the primary factor of prohibition of selling grapes.

These vile molvis and moron muftis who have ruined the Ummah shall still have to circumambulate their own intestines in Jahannam. They have legalized the abhorrent institution of pictography only to gratify their nafsani and lustful desires. They crave to display their snouts on social media. It is the villainous nafs which goads them to recklessly perpetrate the capital sin of halaalizing a practice which Allah Ta'ala has made Haraam and for which many severe warnings of punishment have been sounded in the Hadith.

The following Naseehat of Hadhrat Mufti Muhammad Shafi' (Rahmatullah alayh) should be salubrious for the cliques of aimmah mudhilleen.

“In the authentic Ahadith it is reported that the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: ‘There will be people in my Ummat, who will change the name of wine (giving it some other fancy name) and consume it. And, at these drinking sessions music, singing and dancing, will prevail. Allah Ta'ala will cause them to be swallowed into the earth, and others among them will be transformed into apes and swines.’”

This practice (of changing the names of forbidden things with a view to legalise them) which our Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) mentioned with regard to wine has today been employed by Muslims, not only for wine, but for many other forbidden practices. Practices which the Shariah has proscribed as Haraam (prohibited) have today been painted in the colours of modernity and their

names have been changed so that people could indulge in these forbidden practices without any restraint. These people labour under the misconception that they have escaped the Divine Prosecution by employing this self-deceptive trick.

If they had any insight they would have realised that by the employment of this deception they are guilty of two crimes, i.e. (1) the commission of the sin, the name of which they have changed, and (2) being devoid of regret and shame for the crime thus perpetrated. These are such people who are forgetful of repentance.

... picture-making has been named photography and has thus been declared as lawful. ... interest has been named profit, and has thus been legalized.

والى الله المشتكى ولا حول
ولا قوة الا بالله العلى
العظيم

(My complaint is lodged with Allah Ta'ala. There is no strength and no power, but with Allah, the Great, the Majestic.)

The subject under discussion is the question of photography. This too is one of the links in that chain. Shariah has branded picture-making as an absolute prohibition, and the use of pictures as unlawful. Modern Muslims of today have camouflaged this practice with a new garb. They have turned away from the obsolete

methods of picture-production and have invented a new method of picture-making, giving it a new name in order to escape the verdicts of Prohibition. In this regard there is not much complaint against the modernists who have been tutored and “nourished” in only modernity. Alas! Our complaint is against those who not only have knowledge of the Qur’an and Sunnah, but also venture to criticise sometimes the Aïmma-e-Mujtahideen (the great Jurists of Islam) and our pious Predecessors because they labour under the illusion of being experienced and all-wise. They have dubbed picture-making with the term photography and have issued Fatwas (verdicts) of permissibility ...

These (votaries of photography) in support of their claim state:

“It seems that in the present age all the modern Ulama of enlightened opinion hold the view that photography is not picture-making, and that the term, Tasweer (picture-making) is not applicable to photography.”

“Indeed, it is astonishing to note that these very “modern” Alims of “enlightened opinion” who have shrugged off the Taqleed of the Aïmma-e-Mujtahideen and the Pious Predecessors in consonance with their lowly desires are the very ones who bow their heads in submission to their contemporaries (i.e. those who have issued verdicts declaring photography of animate objects lawful).

The anarchist regards the following (Taqleed) of the great Jurists of Islam as a dark blot, and he does not hesitate to portray the opinions of the overwhelming majority of

Fuqahaa (Jurists) and Muhadditheen who include many Sahabas, as erroneous. It is this type of anarchist who today desires to declare a Haraam act as Halaal with the aid of the Fatwas of a handful of contemporaries. Indeed, it is most shocking to observe that he will not even consider the opinions of Hazrat Ali (radhiyallahu anhu) and Hazrat Ibn Abbaas (radhiyallahu anhu) when these do not conform to his (the anarchist's) fancy. But, the verdicts of a handful of contemporaries are accepted by the anarchist when these conform to his desire notwithstanding the existence of the Fatwas of thousands of Ulama which contradict him."

Shaikh Mustufaa Hamaami (Rahmatullah alayh) of Egypt writes:

"The photographers of our time regard picture-making as a great skill and as a branch of the 'fine-arts' . . . this means that these people regard picture-making as lawful without any qualms. Now, what does the Law state regarding a person who regards a forbidden practice as lawful, and this too, when he has knowledge of its prohibition? We seek Allah's protection. ... Alas! Muslims today have been encircled by this great evil (of photography) to such an extent that there hardly remains a Muslim home without being full with photos. Ponder! Should Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) make an appearance today and observe this evil, what will be his attitude? The great misfortune of the situation is that this fitnah (the evil of photography) prevails in those cities where the inhabitants regard themselves to excel in knowledge."